REMARKS

This Supplemental Preliminary Amendment is submitted to provide varying claim scope for the present application. In view of the foregoing, claims 40, 42, and 46-48 have been amended, new claims 49-51 have been added, and claim 41 has been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

No new matter is presented and all amended claim terms are fully supported by the disclosures from the specification of the present application and the drawings of the present application.

By way of review, and only as a example, independent claim 40 now sets forth:

> 40. A method of channel searching for a digital television receiver, comprising:
>
> converting a received radio frequency (RF) digital broadcast signal into a baseband signal and decoding the converted baseband signal to reconstruct a digital broadcast transport stream which includes audio data, video data, and program information;
>
> extracting the audio data, the video data, and the program information from the reconstructed digital broadcast transport stream and storing the extracted program information in a storage;
>
> processing the extracted audio data to be output as sound;
>
> processing the extracted video data to be output on a screen;
>
> accessing the storage to generate a channel list based on the stored program information,
>
> wherein the channel list is made up of one or more *separately identifiable channel groupings*, each having one or more *two-part channel numbers, where each of the one or more two-part channel numbers includes a main channel number as a first part and a sub-channel number as a second part*, and where each two-part channel number of a respectively identified channel grouping has a same main channel number and different sub-channel numbers; and
>
> enabling a user to navigate the channel list to search a two part channel number,
>
> wherein *information included in the channel list is derived from program associated information from a Program Specific Information (PSI) table*, for plural programs included in the transport stream *conforming with an MPEG standard*, wherein *an identifiable program according to the MPEG standard is distinguished from a predetermined corresponding two-part channel number*.

Using FIG. 4B as only an example, FIG. 4B illustrates plural channel grouping identifiers, i.e., 52, 53, and 57 that are also respectively referred to by reference nos. 480, 460, and 470. For example, the specification of the present application refers to these channel grouping identifiers as "Channel No. 52", "Channel No. 53", and "Channel No. 57". The present application explains that these identifiers correspond to typical channels, and are not the same as the differently

referred to "channel number", i.e., with regard to a main channel number or a sub-channel number, and further this channel grouping identifier is not the same as the combined main channel number and sub-channel number. As only an example, see paragraphs [0054] and [0066] of the present application.

To more clearly differentiate these different 'numbers', the pending claims have been amended to refer to each main channel number and sub-channel number combination as "a two-part channel number," and referred to the illustrated grouping of a main-channel number and one or more related sub-channel numbers as a "channel grouping" or "separately identifiable channel groupings."

Additionally, the relationship between each channel grouping and the illustrated channel indicator has also been clarified in one or more dependent claims, where the identifiable aspect of each of the channel groupings is claimed as a "channel grouping indicator." For example, claim 47 sets forth: "wherein *the one or more two-part channel numbers* of the first channel grouping *are collectively displayed* in a same direction with *a first channel grouping identifier representing the first channel grouping*."

Here, the respective channel groupings and the two-part channel numbers, such as illustrated in FIGS. 4A, 4B, and/or 4C, as only examples, may correspond to an ATSC standard, as also more particularly claimed in dependent claims 49 and 50.

Differences between program information, provided and defined by an MPEG standard, and channel information, which may be defined by the ATSC standard, are more clearly set forth in the above amendment to claim 40, by reciting: "wherein information included in the channel list is derived from program associated information from a Program Specific Information (PSI) table, for plural programs included in the transport stream conforming with an MPEG standard, wherein an identifiable program according to the MPEG standard is distinguished from a predetermined corresponding two-part channel number."

Accordingly, the illustrated 'prog' in FIGS. 4A-C is merely representing information regarding the underlying program that has been uniquely identified, e.g., according to the claimed identifiable program, as being pointed to or represented by a similarly uniquely identified two-part channel number. Therefore, FIGS. 4A-C should not be interpreted as displaying program numbers, but rather information of the underlying program and the two-part channel number.

For example, 'program numbers' are defined by an MPEG standard, and are typically

never seen by the user. Rather, the user can access only the two-part channel numbers. In an ATSC standard a Virtual Channel Table is used to at least identify or link what underlying program, represented by the unique program number, should be obtained if the user decides to tune to a particular two-part channel number (ATSC), such as when the user selects the two-part channel number 52-1 (ATSC) the VCT, for example, may identify what underlying program number (MPEG) should be obtained and presented to the user.

Again, it is noted that MPEG standards have been in existence for many years and are independent of ATSC standards.

In an effort to force the two distinct systems together by the present inventors, as only an example, there may be a mechanism for maintaining use of the *existing* user-unknown program number (MPEG) and an *existing* particular corresponding user-known two-part channel number, e.g., by use of such a VCT. It is respectfully submitted that none of the previously relied upon or identified references disclose or suggest such achievements and fail to disclose or suggest all the claimed features of the pending claims.

For example, though the previously rejected claims 3-25, 27, and 37-39 have been cancelled, the previously relied upon Masataka, JP Publication No. 10-013758, Cuccia, U.S. Patent No. 6,337,719, and Saitoh, U.S. Patent No. 5,444,499, are now moot, these references will be only briefly discussed, in addition to the Examiner's newly identified Schneidewend et al., US Patent No. 6.249.320.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that none of the previously relied upon Masataka, Cuccia, or Saitoh references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all the claimed features of the pending claims of the present application.

In addition, it is noted that the newly identified Schneidewend et al. reference does not correspond to an ATSC standard, for example FIG. 3 of the Schneidewend et al. reference does not correspond to any table of the A/65 ATSC standard, and further fails to set forth two-part channel numbers that are collectively selected for a single underlying program. Still further, the Schneidewend et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest the remaining claimed feature, whether considered alone or in combination with any of the Masataka, Cuccia, or Saitoh references.

Lastly, it is respectfully submitted that the Schneidewend et al. reference should **not** be permitted to claim priority from either the parent application, now issued as a patent, or the provisional application relied upon by the parent application, as the Schneidewend et al.

reference is **not a proper Continuation-in-Part application**. The Schneidewend et al. reference does not have a common inventor with the parent application, and the original signed Declaration for the Schneidewend et al. reference equally did not include a common inventor from the parent application. The applicants of the Schneidewend et al. reference appear to have tried to overlap one inventor form the parent application, but that potentially overlapping inventor was removed when the actual Declaration was signed and submitted to meet the requirements for obtaining a filing date.

Therefore, the Schneidewend et al. reference is not a proper CIP application, such that the 102 date for the Schneidewend et al. reference should **only** be the US filing date of the CIP application.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully requested that this Preliminary Amendment be entered in the above-referenced application. It is further respectfully submitted that the pending claims are in allowable condition.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Preliminary Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 16, 20123 By: _____

Stephen T. Boughner
Registration No. 45,317

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501